UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,214	08/29/2006	Tomoyuki Hasegawa	Q92149	2252
23373 7590 05/09/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			MOORE, SUSANNA	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/561,214	HASEGAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SUSANNA MOORE	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20, 22 and 23</u> is/are pending in the a	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	• •					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-20, 22 and 23</u> are subject to restricti	on and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers	·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
<i>,</i>	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c		• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1624

## DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group (I), claim(s) 1-15, 17 and 20, drawn to 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7- dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine methanesulfonate, a crystalline form, simple compositions and a process of making said compound.

Group (II), claim(s) 16, drawn to a complex composition with 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7- dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine methanesulfonate and another active ingredient.

Group (III), claim(s) 18 and 19, drawn to an injection with a compound of 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7- dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine methanesulfonate.

Group (IV), claim(s) 22 and 23, drawn to a process of making a compound of formula (I), an Ar-CH-(CN)C(O)R.

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1 and 13.2 since, under 37 CFR 1.475(a) Group I -Group IV lack unity of invention since under 37 CFR 1.475:

Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features...those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The technical feature corresponding of Groups (I) is the compound 8-(3-Pentylamino)-2-methyl-3-(2-chloro-4-methoxyphenyl)-6,7- dihydro-5H-cyclopenta[d]pyrazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine methanesulfonate. The special technical feature of Group (II), is the compound of Group (I) in complex composition with another active ingredient. The special technical feature of Group (III) is an injection with the compound of Group (I). The special technical feature of Group (IV) is a process of making compounds of formula (I), which do not embrace the compound of Group (I). Therefore Groups (I-IV) are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept and there is a lack of unity of invention because they lack a special technical feature.

Accordingly, unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unity of invention is considered to be proper.

Therefore, since the claims do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and lack the same or corresponding special technical features, the claims lack unity of invention and should be limited to only the product.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

Application/Control Number: 10/561,214 Page 4

Art Unit: 1624

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include

(i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either

instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

## Rejoinder Advisory

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is

Application/Control Number: 10/561,214 Page 6

Art Unit: 1624

withdrawn by the Examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Susanna Moore whose telephone number is (571) 272-9046. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susanna Moore/

Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/Brenda L. Coleman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624